



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/759,409

01/16/2004

Luciano M. Silva

RSW920030258US1 (140)

7485

46320

7590

03/08/2011

CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP

STEVEN M. GREENBERG

950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE

SUITE 2022

BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

PARK, JEONG S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2454

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/08/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                                      |  |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/759,409 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>SILVA, LUCIANO M. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Jeong S. Park     | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2454                  |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the Board Decision filed on 12/21/2010, which reversed claims 4-7 and 17, and affirmed claims 8-16. Claims 4-16 have been examined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 4-7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 4 is drawn toward a system comprising an application framework, a first view, and access checking logic which is merely software, per se. As such, software, per se does not establish a statutory category of invention.

Claims 5-7 and 17, which are dependent on claim 4, are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set

Art Unit: 2454

forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck et al. (hereinafter Schaeck)(U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0163513) in view of Soluk et al. (hereinafter Soluk)(U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0168152).

Regarding claim 4, Schaeck teaches as follows:

A system for programmatic role-based security in a dynamically generated user interface (methods, systems, and computer program products are disclosed for **providing role-specific views** from a business web portal which supports one or more aggregated web services. Users having particular roles can be programmatically presented with different views into an aggregated service, see, e.g., Abstract), the system comprising:

an application framework configured through a deployment descriptor comprising a listing of a set of views (multiple role-specific views will be based on the services and/or information which are relevant to a particular role, see, e.g., paragraph [0043]) and a listing of associated program logic (the fine-grained services may include **any form of programming logic**, including script programs, Java.TM. classes, COM classes, EJBs ("Enterprise JavaBeans".TM.), stored procedures, IMS or other database transactions, legacy applications, and so forth, see, e.g., paragraph [0052]).

a first view (interpreted as role-specific portal page) listed in said deployment descriptor and comprising a linkage to a second view (interpreted as composite service provided through the portal page) listed in said deployment descriptor (a portal page

Art Unit: 2454

which provides an entry point into the composite service is then presented to the user, see, e.g., paragraph [0084]); and,

access checking logic disposed in said first view and programmed to omit said linkage where a role of an end user accessing said first view is not authorized to access said second view according to said listing of said set of authorized roles in said deployment descriptor (providing a view of the aggregated service which properly **reflects the user's role** across the set of sub-services, see, e.g., paragraph [0069]). Therefore the end user only get access to a set of sub-services (equivalent to applicant's second view) based on the user's role.

Schaeck teaches of selecting a role-specific portlet based on user's role determined from a profile repository (see, e.g., paragraph [0082]) but not teach of a listing of a set of authorized roles for selected ones of said views.

Soluk teaches as follow:

Identifying one or more roles associated with a target server and displaying a list of the identified roles to the user. This listing may include the name of the target server and **the roles that are associated with the target server** (equivalent to applicant's listed roles for selected views). The user may use a mouse or other pointing device to select a particular role from the list of roles (see, e.g., paragraph [0046]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schaeck with Soluk to include the method or system of presenting a list of roles associated with the selected target server as taught by Soluk in order for the user to select a particular role from the list of roles.

Regarding claim 17, Schaeck teaches as follows:

Wherein said access checking logic is programmed to display said linkage where a role of the end user accessing said first view is authorized to access said second view (the selected role-specific portlet only provides access to sub-services for those who are authorized based on the user's role, see, e.g., paragraph [0020]).

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck et al. (hereinafter Schaeck)(U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0163513) in view of Soluk et al. (hereinafter Soluk)(U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0168152) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Schenk (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0004887).

Regarding claim 5, Schaeck in view of Soluk teaches all the limitations except for using Struts framework as the application framework incorporating the JSPs.

Schenk teaches as follows:

A configuration file is used to configure the presentation of an object (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0015]); and

Java server pages can be generated with Struts framework, as open source framework of utilizing pre-stored design patterns (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0017], lines 15-19).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schaeck in view of Soluk with Schenk to include Struts framework as an application framework incorporating the JSPs as taught by Schenk in order to facilitate the development of JSPs applications.

7. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck et al. (hereinafter Schaeck)(U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0163513) in view of Soluk et al. (hereinafter Soluk)(U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0168152) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Dubois et al. (hereinafter Dubois)(U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0154646).

Regarding claim 6, Schaeck in view of Soluk does not teach of the program logic comprises servlets and wherein said views comprise Java server pages (JSPs).

Dubois teaches as follows:

The SPE is a password-protected, Web-based application framework for executing user data provisioning applications. The SPE application consists primarily of **servlets to provide the program logic and Java Server Pages to provide the presentation logic** (equivalent to applicant's views)(see, e.g., paragraph [0119]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schaeck in view of Soluk with Dubois to include servlets and Java Server Pages as taught by Dubois in order to efficiently provide the program logic and presentation logic respectively.

Regarding claim 7, Schaeck teaches as follows:

Said first view (interpreted as portlet page provided to the user) for invoking said access checking logic and for omitting said linkage responsive to said access checking logic (the selected role-specific portlet shows available linkage based on the user's role, see, e.g., paragraph [0020]). Therefore the portlet page automatically omits the linkage not available based on the user's role.

Soluk teaches as follows:

Displays a list of the identified roles to the user and the user may use a mouse or other pointing device to select a particular role from the list of roles (see, e.g., paragraph [0046]). The examiner interpreted the custom tag as displaying options for user to select among list of roles.

Therefore, it is rejected for similar reason as presented above in claim 6.

8. Claims 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bazinet et al. (hereinafter Bazinet)(U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0167298 A1), and further in view of Vasandani et al. (hereinafter Vasandani)(U.S. Patent No. 6,985,946 B1).

Regarding claim 8 and 12, Bazinet teaches as follows:

A method for programmatic user privilege based security in a dynamically generated user interface (see, e.g., abstract), the method comprising the steps of:

authenticating access to a rendering of a selected view based upon an end user's privileges (access privileges of the authenticated user) requesting access to said selected view (see, e.g., step 414 in figure 4 and page 3, paragraph [0037]);

processing said selected view to identify a method call to access checking logic (see, e.g., steps 422-434 in figure 4 and page 4, paragraphs [0042]-[0044]); and

disposing a link to said different view in said rendering of said selected view conditional upon said role matches a role in said set of roles (the privilege stored in the portal generic objects database)(the portal application generate a page to the client containing entries corresponding to the backend applications that the authenticated user



Art Unit: 2454

can access based on the access privileges of the authenticated user, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0038] and step 416 in figure 4).

Bazinet does not teach role based security access and following steps of using it but all limitations with user's privilege based security access.

Vasandani teaches as follows:

Providing role based access security within a networked computing system (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 40-43);

the method for providing an authentication and authorization pipeline having a userID-roles database and a resource-roles database for use in a web server to grant access to web resources to users (see, e.g., col. 2, line 58 to col. 3, line 9); and

comparing said role (userID-roles object, 211 in figure 4) to a set of roles (roles/access database, 422 in figure 4) authorized to access a different view (requested resource) associated with said access checking logic (the roles authorization module retrieves the database entry for the requested resource using the URI and attempts to match a role from the userID-roles object with the roles in the roles/access database entry, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bazinet to include the method of role based security access as taught by Vasandani in order to efficiently control security access by the user's roles predefined.

Regarding claims 9-11 and 13-15, Vasandani teaches as follows:

Said step of authenticating comprises the step of comparing said role (userID-roles object, 211 in figure 4) to a set of roles (roles/access database, 422 in figure 4) associated with said selected view to locate a match for said role (the roles authorization module retrieves the database entry for the requested resource using the URI and attempts to match a role from the userID-roles object with the roles in the roles/access database entry, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 1-4);

said locating step comprises the step of parsing a deployment descriptor (roles/access database, 422 in figure 4) for an application framework hosting said selected view and said different view to identify said set of roles (this is inherent process for authorization module 202 in figure 4, see, e.g., col. 7, line 53 to col. 8, line 11); and

said processing step comprises the step of invoking external access checking logic for a located server page tag referencing said access checking logic (this is inherent process for authorization module 202 in figure 4, see, e.g., col. 7, line 53 to col. 8, line 11).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bazinet to include the method of role based security access as taught by Vasandani in order to efficiently control security access by the user's roles predefined.

Regarding claim 16, Bazinet teaches as follows:

A method for programmatic user privilege based security in a dynamically generated user interface (see, e.g., abstract), the method comprising the steps of:

configuring a deployment descriptor (portal generic objects database, 203 in

Art Unit: 2454

figure 2)(populating a portal generic object database, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0032]); and

composing a server page to include a reference to said external access checking logic and to invoke said external access in order to conditionally incorporate a link to a specific view associated with a specific set of authorized roles (the portal application, 102 in figure 1 and 502 in figure 5, generates a page to the client containing entries corresponding to the backend applications, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0038]).

Vasandani teaches as follows:

Providing role based access security within a networked computing system (see, e.g., col. 2, lines 40-43);

the method for providing an authentication and authorization pipeline having a userID-roles database and a resource-roles database for use in a web server to grant access to web resources to users (see, e.g., col. 2, line 58 to col. 3, line 9); and

programming external access checking logic to match a parameterized role (userID-roles object, 211 in figure 4) with a role disposed in said set of roles in said deployment descriptor (roles/access database, 422 in figure 4)(the roles authorization module retrieves the database entry for the requested resource using the URI and attempts to match a role from the userID-roles object with the roles in the roles/access database entry, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bazinet to include the method of role based security access as taught by Vasandani in order to efficiently control security access by the user's roles

Art Unit: 2454

predefined.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeong S. Park whose telephone number is (571)270-1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00 - 5:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph E. Avellino can be reached on 571-272-3905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. S. P./

Application/Control Number: 10/759,409

Page 12

Art Unit: 2454

Examiner, Art Unit 2454

March 4, 2011

/Joseph E. Avellino/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454